DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 340 FL 026 293

AUTHOR Wiese, Ann-Marie
TITLE "Trying To Find A Way To Make This Work": A Bilingual Teacher's Negotiation of Goals and Instruction.
PUB DATE 2000-04-28
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Education Programs; *Bilingual Teachers; Classroom Techniques; *Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Federal Legislation; Language Minorities; Learning Strategies; Limited English Speaking; Literacy; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Spanish Speaking; *Teacher Role; Teaching Methods; Urban Areas

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to understand how teachers negotiate decisions about goals and instruction for language minority students and how these decisions play out in classroom interactions. Much of bilingual education research focuses on program evaluation and implementation and, consequently, overlooks the critical role teachers play in the actual implementation of policies, namely, how the teacher makes decisions, what influences those decisions, and how those decisions are linked to and constructed by the school's bilingual program. Teachers make decisions about student language goals and instruction that shape the actual academic experiences of their students. Research in bilingual education should attend more carefully to the role of the teacher in learning and instruction. The research project discussed here investigates the student language goals and classroom instruction of an urban elementary school bilingual teacher and presents an analysis of the many influences that guided her instruction over 2 academic years, during which the bilingual program at her school underwent restructuring. The theoretical framework of this study draws upon educational policy and research on both teaching and bilingual education. The influence and effects of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 and Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are extensively examined. Some of the weaknesses in the system that the teacher encountered include the following: (1) weak support structures for teacher collaboration; (2) inconsistent student language goals; (3) lack of strategic student placement; and (4) a lack of program articulation in Title VII meetings. (Contains 29 references.) (KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 441 340

"Trying to find a way to make this work": A bilingual teacher's negotiation of goals and instruction

Ann-Marie Wiese
Education in Language, Literacy, and Culture
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720-1670

email: amwiese@uclink4.berkeley.edu
phone: (510) 643-8504

American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, Louisiana
April 28, 2000
49.36 Roundtable Session:
Teachers' and Students' Cognition in Bilingual/ESL Instruction
2:15 pm - 2:55 pm Marriot, Carondelet

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ann-Marie Wiese
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2B

FL026263

"Trying to find a way to make this work":
A bilingual teacher's negotiation of goals and instruction

Abstract

Overall, this small scale qualitative study allowed me to enter into the world of a bilingual teacher negotiating the multiple influences on planning goals and instruction for her language minority students. Karen's teaching philosophy, which she views as aligned with Title VII legislation, and her past teaching experience clearly shape her current student language goals and instruction. In addition, Karen moves outside the arena of her own classroom in her efforts to collaborate with others. She also takes an active role in the restructuring of the bilingual program as a way to change what she views as constraints on her efforts to teach effectively and to collaborate. Karen's situation exemplifies a need for individual teacher reflective practice and collaborative discussions among teachers about teaching philosophy and student goals.

The purpose of this study is to understand how teachers negotiate decisions about goals and instruction for language minority students and how those decisions play out in classroom interactions. Much of bilingual education research focuses on program evaluation and program implementation, and consequently, overlooks the critical role teachers play in the actual implementation of policies. Teachers make decisions about student language goals and instruction which shape the actual academic experiences of their students. Therefore, to better address the needs of language minority students, research in bilingual education should attend to the role of the teacher in learning and instruction. This research project investigates the student language goals and classroom instruction of an elementary school bilingual teacher and presents an analysis of the many influences that guide her instruction during two academic years. The study site is an urban elementary school in the midst of restructuring their bilingual education program. Fairfield Elementary[1] successfully competed for a Title VII comprehensive school grant[2], which is aimed at individual schools, or pairs of schools which have significant concentrations of limited English proficient students (at least 25% of the school enrollment).

Background

The theoretical framework of this study draws upon educational policy, research on bilingual education, and research on teaching. While the broader context of federal bilingual education policy has shaped the research on bilingual education, it also lives in the everyday events of classroom life. Here, teachers serve as a link to students, and research on teaching frames my views on the important role of teachers. This study investigates a bilingual teacher's negotiations of the language and literacy curriculum for language minority students, recognizing the complexity of teachers' work and the local enactment of policy.

Federal Bilingual Education Policy

[1] All names of districts, schools, teachers, and students are fictional to protect their privacy.
[2] All information provided on comprehensive school grants is found in the Improving America's Schools Act, 1994, Sections 7114 and 7116.

On six occasions the U. S. Congress has passed specific legislation related to the education of language minority students (1968, 1974, 1978, 1984, 1988, 1994). The Bilingual Education Act (BEA, 1968), Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 serves as a guide for state and local policy regarding language minority students. Since its inception, the primary aim of the BEA has been "providing meaningful and equitable access for English-language learners to the curriculum, rather than serving as an instrument of language policy for the nation through the development of their native languages" (August & Hakuta, 1997, p. 16). In other words, the BEA has aimed to address equal educational opportunity for language minority students, and has not evolved as a language policy. The 1994 reauthorization of the BEA still aims to "to ensure equal educational opportunity for all children and youth and to promote educational excellence . . . for children and youth of limited English proficiency" (BEA, 1994, Section 7102 (c)). In particular, this reauthorization introduces new grant categories, gives preference to programs which promote bilingualism, introduces language enhancement of indigenous languages, and stands as part of a larger systemic reform effort.

Research on Bilingual Education

Research on bilingual education has followed primarily three paths: program evaluation, basic research on bilingualism and second language learning, and studies of school and classroom effectiveness (August & Hakuta, 1997). While this research has contributed to an understanding of education for language minority students, it has not investigated teachers as active participants who negotiate a literacy curriculum along various dimensions.

Due to the tension over the role of native language instruction, research on bilingual education has been dominated by process-product evaluations of bilingual and alternative programs of instruction. Unfortunately, since this program evaluation is driven by political interests, studies support a variety of positions (August & Hakuta, 1997). Moreover, program

evaluation centers the discussion of academic achievement on general programs of instruction, rather than the intricacies of daily life in the classroom.

Basic research on second language learning and the development of bilingual children has provided a theoretical basis for including native language instruction as a bridge to English language proficiency and academic achievement. However, this research is generally characterized as descriptive, and not necessarily concerned with academic outcomes (August & Hakuta, 1997). This and other research on effective teaching practices provides a rich theoretical base on which teachers can draw, but does not address how teachers decide upon particular ways of teaching. So, while research on bilingual education has contributed to an understanding of education for language minority students, there is a need to further investigate the role of teachers and how they create curriculum.

Teachers: The Link between Policies, Programs, and Curriculum

Once policies are created, they are not just filtered through the educational system and enacted by teachers (Jennings, 1996). Rather, teachers meet theories and policies at the classroom door as they create a literacy curriculum for their students. For example, once a school community adopts a particular program of instruction for language minority students, it must allocate instructional time to each language, determine whether content areas will be taught through the first language or second language, and decide upon the roles of first and second language literacy (Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). Depending on the school, teachers may make these decisions individually or with colleagues. Adopting a program model does not provide a detailed plan of how to implement the program in every classroom, with every teacher and every student. The teacher is left to negotiate among various influences to create a literacy curriculum for her[3] students.

In a recent review of the literature on teacher beliefs and knowledge, Calderhead (1996) describes how early research on teaching adopted a narrow view of teacher knowledge

[3] Since the participant in this study is a female, I will use feminine pronouns.

which neglected the social complexity of daily life in the classroom. Using a process-product design, teaching behaviors were linked to student learning outcomes as measured by achievement tests (Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987). Jackson's (1968) Life in Classrooms was a key contribution to the field because it shifted the focus of educational research to the classroom. Jackson characterized teachers' work as complex, full of uncertainties and decisions. Various researchers have continued to explore ways in which teachers' knowledge and belief are manifested in their teaching practices (Clandinin, 1985; Elbaz, 1981; Grossman, 1990; Shulman, 1987). In fact, teachers' implicit theories have been described as theories of practice which underlie their curricular decisions and interactions (Genishi, Dubetz, & Focarino, 1995).

While research on teaching has recognized the complexity of teachers' work, educational policy evaluation has viewed teachers as conduits of policy. There is a need to investigate the local enactment of policy in the daily lives of teachers and students, "to look at policy with a pedagogical eye" (Darling-Hammond, 1990, p. 340). In a recent study of how Michigan's reading policy is enacted in the practices of three teachers, Jennings (1996) describes policy implementation as an incident of teaching and learning, where teachers construct their own understandings of particular policies, drawing upon prior knowledge and beliefs. In fact, a recent study of two bilingual teachers' literacy instruction builds upon this view of teachers as learners. Jimenez and Gersten (1999) introduce the term "infusion" to describe the relationship between newer ideas and principles related to literacy and a teacher's routinized instructional practice. As teacher's construct a literacy curriculum, it is infused with policy reforms, beliefs and knowledge, as well as the broader school context.

The theoretical grounding of this study stems from bilingual education policy, bilingual education research, and research on teaching. Teachers must be viewed as active participants in the local construction of curriculum; they are not merely conduits of policy or educational theory. In creating a literacy curriculum, they are faced with the daunting task of negotiating among these influences in addition to their beliefs, knowledge, and relationships

with colleagues. To understand the complexity of teachers' work, it is important to undertake an alternative approach in research methodology. To this end, this study investigates teachers' work drawing upon an interpretive paradigm and adopting an ethnographic design.

Method

An Interpretive Paradigm

The phenomenon of this study is how one teacher negotiates a literacy curriculum for language minority students. The goal of this study was not to evaluate a particular bilingual program or educational policy, so a process-product design was not appropriate. The goal of this study was to understand the local complexity of creating a literacy curriculum from the perspective of one teacher's experiences. An interpretive paradigm was appropriate for this study because it does not seek specific laws of causation or precise predictions, but rather offers opportunities to consider the complexities of teaching and learning by embedding them in the details of everyday life in schools (Dyson, 1995).

Using an interpretive paradigm allowed me to investigate how an individual in specific social situations made sense of her everyday interactions (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Erickson, 1986). The broader research question investigated how one teacher negotiates a literacy curriculum for language minority students. More specific research questions addressed the different dimensions of that negotiation. Individually, the teacher's beliefs and knowledge influence her decisions. Socially, the teacher negotiates with others including teachers, parents, and administrators. She also negotiates during literacy instruction with students. All these negotiations inevitably involve organizational structures such as educational policy at local, state, and federal levels.

Research Setting and Case

The study site is FairfieldElementary, a bilingual elementary school in a large urban school district. During Year 1[4], Fairfield Elementary had 705 students and 33 classroom

[4] Year 1 refers to the 1996-1997 school year. Year 2 refers to the 1997-1998 school year.

teachers. Twenty-six percent (181) of the students were classified as limited English proficient (LEP) and twenty different languages were represented at the school. The bilingual education program served, and continues to serve, the largest language minority student population, Spanish-speakers.

Fairfield Elementary successfully competed for a federal Title VII comprehensive school grant[5], which is aimed at individual schools, or pairs of schools which have significant concentrations of limited English proficient students (at least 25% of the school enrollment). The school will receive 1.2 million dollars to fund a five year project to improve services for LEP students. The legislation outlines provisions for termination of funds, authorized activities, and the characteristics of an eligible entry. However, the legislation does not prescribe particular methods of instruction; each school must create a program based on the general goals of the legislation and then justify the particular strategies.

Fairfield Elementary decided to restructure its bilingual program with Title VII funds. Through the restructuring process, the current early-exit[6] bilingual program will evolve into one which promotes bilingualism and biliteracy for all students. Through this process, the school community plans to articulate clear language and literacy goals for all students, to establish systems for teacher collaboration, and to create appropriate achievement and language competency assessment tools. In line with the 1994 BEA, the first year was dedicated to "plan, train personnel, develop curriculum, and acquire or develop materials" (Section 7114(b)(4)). So, during Year 1, teachers at Fairfield participated in staff development opportunities regarding language minority students, the school community met to discuss the future of the bilingual program, and a Title VII coordinator was hired to coordinate meetings, order materials, and plan with the Title VII assessment coordinator at the school. During the 1997-1998 school year, the Spanish immersion program had begun in one kindergarten

[5] A detailed description of the grant competition is found in Sections 7114 and 7116 of the BEA, 1994.
[6] Early exit transitional bilingual education programs do not encourage maintenance of the primary language once students are transitioned into English mainstream classrooms, which usually happens by third or fourth grade. Native language instruction is used as a bridge to continue academic development while acquiring English.

classroom, and the school continues to discuss how to develop the rest of the bilingual program. As Fairfield articulates a bilingual program, Title VII will hold the school accountable to its own goals, assessments, and evaluation procedures. So, the plan that Fairfield Elementary develops will affect school-wide policies and individual teacher instruction.

This paper focused on Karen, a bilingual teacher who has a California BCLAD[7] teaching credential, her first grade class during Year 1 and her second grade class during Year 2. She has taught for several years in two-way immersion bilingual programs[8] in the greater Los Angeles area. This first grade class consisted of nineteen students, eleven males and eight females. All the students were of Mexican-American or Latin American descent and spoke Spanish as a primary language. They were all limited English proficient students. Karen was responsible for the academic development of the students in both languages, and had a great deal of freedom in designating goals and instructional time to the specific languages. Spanish was the primary language of instruction, with forty-five minutes to one hour of English as a second language (ESL) instruction daily.

Three times a week Karen's students were integrated with students from a monolingual English first grade class. Consequently, each group had both Spanish-speakers and English-speakers. During this time, Karen taught in Spanish, which served as a Spanish as a second language lesson (SSL) for the English speaking students. Andrea, the general education first grade teacher, taught in English which then served as an ESL lesson for the Spanish speaking students.

The follow-up study conducted during Year 2 followed Karen to second grade. As she moved to second grade she kept several of the same students. The second grade class consisted of seventeen students, twelve males and five females. Eleven of the students were

---

[7] BCLAD stands for Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development. BCLAD certification is a California teaching credential which incorporates courses on how to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students with an emphasis in a second language. The official title is Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development.

[8] Two-way immersion bilingual programs aim for bilingualism and biliteracy for all students, in English and a target language. At the schools were Karen taught, the target language was Spanish.

in Karen's first grade class. Those eleven students were all Mexican-American and spoke Spanish as a first language. The remaining six students were English-speakers. Of those six students one was Mexican-American and the other five were African-American. As in Year 1, Karen was responsible for the academic development of these students, and she had flexibility in setting goals and determining how instructional time would be distributed to each language of instruction. English and Spanish alternated as the language of the day, for general instruction and direct lessons in various content areas. Each day students received language and literacy instruction in their primary language. When English was the language of the day, Spanish speakers received English language development through content area lessons, such as science or mathematics.

Data Collection Techniques and Procedures

My task as an ethnographer was to reveal how each teacher's beliefs and values guide her own actions and understanding of those actions. To this end, I drew upon different "slices of data" through the following data collection techniques: ongoing open-ended interviews, participant observation, and content analysis of pertinent documents (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Weiss, 1994). I explored Karen's role as teacher both inside the classroom and outside the classroom to gain insight into various social dynamic factors. For example, I observed Karen during the following events: the language arts and self-contained ESL parts of the day to learn about how student goals are enacted in the instruction. I observed five language arts lessons and three ESL lessons (see Table 1). I focused on Karen's interactions in whole class settings, small group settings, and some interactions with individual students. I also observed Karen at one staff planning meeting to gain insight into the negotiation of student goals with other teachers and administrators (see Table 1). All observations were recorded in field notes, and some observations were supplemented with audio taping.

In addition, I conducted two interviews with Karen to discuss the bilingual education program, how she developed student goals, and how she planned for instruction. These

interviews allowed me access to Karen's personal reflections and perspectives. They were recorded in field notes, and one was supplemented with audio taping. Both were scheduled at Karen's convenience. Data collection took place from February through the beginning of April 1997[9].

For the follow-up study, Karen was still my key informant and the focus of my study. Consequently, I observed her inside the classroom and outside the classroom. I observed Karen during two writer's workshop lessons and an English language development lesson (see Table 1). I focused on Karen's interactions with students in whole class settings, with students working in pairs, and with individual students. I also observed Karen at a Title VII planning meeting, to gain insight into the negotiation of student goals with other teachers, parents, and administrators in light of the Title VII grant. All observations were recorded in field notes and on audio tape. In addition, I conducted a formal interview with Karen to discuss the bilingual education program, her goals, and her instruction for students, focusing on any changes since the previous year. The interview was scheduled at Karen's convenience. The interview was recorded in fieldnotes and on audio tape. For Year 2, data collection took place during May and June of 1998. Overall, data collection did not interfere with either the teacher or the students' daily school requirements.

[9] I conducted a brief follow-up interview in the Fall of 1997.

Table 1

Lessons and Activities Observed

	DATE	LESSON/ACTIVITY	LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION
1	2/24/97	language arts	Spanish
2	2/27/97	language arts	Spanish
3	3/3/97	language arts	Spanish
4	3/10/97	ESL	English
5	3/13/97	ESL	English
6	3/17/97	staff meeting	not applicable
7	3/20/97	language arts	Spanish
8	3/25/97	ESL	English
9	3/27/97	language arts	Spanish
10	5/26/98	Title VII meeting	Spanish (and some English)
11	5/27/98	writer's workshop	Spanish and English
12	5/28/98	writer's workshop	English and Spanish
13	6/3/98	ELD & science	English

Data Analysis Procedures

The analytic practices I chose to pursue were influenced by the "grounded theory" approach to analyzing qualitative data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Still, while "grounded theory" emphasizes the discovery and modification of theory, I recognize the reflexive interplay between theory and data (Emerson et al., 1995).

Data analysis techniques included open coding, focused coding, and theoretical memos. For open coding, I read through my interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and documents, keeping my research questions in mind. This allowed me to identify and formulate ideas, themes, and issues of interest (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Then, through focused coding I subjected fieldnotes and transcripts to a fine-grained, line-by-line analysis based on key themes (Emerson et al., 1995). This included drafting analytic summaries of observations to document patterns of interaction among key participants. Overall, as an ethnographer created a representation of reality drawing upon these data analysis techniques (Emerson et al., 1995).

Karen's Teaching Philosophy

Karen's teaching philosophy was grounded in notions of language and literacy development for language minority students. While she did not specifically mention Title VII legislation as a guiding force, she did mention the local restructuring of the bilingual program. She placed great hope in how the restructuring process could lead to a more cohesive bilingual education program with support for teacher collaboration, clear language goals, and consistent instructional methods. In addition, she believed that the Title VII grant actually mirrored her own theoretical notions. She believes in "bilingualism, in biliteracy, and in the integration of students from diverse backgrounds."[10] When asked to describe her teaching philosophy, Karen specifically spoke about language and literacy development.

When asked to describe her teaching philosophy in Year 1, Karen said her beliefs about language development were grounded in the work of Krashen and Cummins[11], two well-known researchers in the field of bilingual education. She added that good teaching should be grounded in research, as well as "common sense" and her own "personal experiences as a student."

In terms of her curriculum, Karen believes that the first grade curriculum "really focuses" on literacy. She described how students need to develop native language literacy which is "more fluid, more natural" while continuing to develop native oral fluency. Then when students "are really strong in Spanish reading and English speaking I really don't believe it (the transition to English literacy) will be difficult." For the second grade curriculum, Karen still valued native language instruction. She believes "it would be . . . not only deserved, it would be beneficial to have instruction in Spanish, in their native language. . . (it is) educationally sound." The following description of a student who was in both her first and second grade classes illustrates her commitment to native language literacy instruction:

---

[10] Any text presented in quotation marks or as an indented, block is a direct quote; . . . indicates words omitted; ( ) indicates words inserted, or nonverbal description; italics indicate translation from Spanish to English.

[11] See Krashen (in Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991) and Cummins (1981, 1994).

> Guillermo who used be a low Spanish reader. He can read in English now. . . . those kids did really good. A lot them did really good. . . . And I think it's because they were in a bilingual program, you know. . . A lot of them, probably like Guillermo for instance, if he were in an English class, I think he would have really struggled.

Overall, Karen believes that native language instruction provides a foundation from which they can build strong abilities in both languages, at both first and second grade.

When teaching first grade, Karen wanted her students to be "really strong in Spanish reading . . (and in) writing, I want them all to be at . . . an equal level . . . of what that would be in reading." This included acquiring specific skills to support literacy such as "I want them to understand . . . what a sentence is . . . that you start with a capital . . . and punctuation." Furthermore, Karen wanted her students to "understand the purposes of reading and writing," to be "excited about reading and writing" and to "seek out a variety of activities that involve reading and writing." She also provided students opportunities "to really develop their (oral) primary language. . . (in) . . . many different subjects." Native language and literacy learning moved beyond the mechanics of reading and writing, "to read and write every day . . . . We're going to read and we're going to write, and the purpose is to communicate, not just for being a skill in itself." When asked about the primary aim of ESL lessons, Karen responded, "It's for each child to grow a substantial amount from . . . wherever they're at." So, Karen focused on Spanish language arts and self-contained ESL lessons to help students meet these aims.

As discussed above, for second grade Karen still had a strong commitment to native language literacy instruction, but she also had Spanish speakers and English speakers in her class. Not surprisingly, she distinguished what she wanted each of these groups of students to accomplish. According to Karen, it was still important for Spanish speaking students:

> to become very strong readers in Spanish and very strong writers. . . just real fluency. And to be able to read different types of materials. And to write . . . different types of writing. Letters, and journals, . . . interviews, or stories. . . . And then to just have a little confidence in their reading and writing abilities.

In addition, she still aimed for these students "to have fluency in English" without specific reference to reading and writing English.

For the English speaking students, Karen also strove for native language oral and literacy development. For their second language, Karen spoke of:

> Spanish comprehension . . . to function in the classroom . . . And then, their oral Spanish skills, my expectations would be that they learned some basic stuff, a lot of vocabulary, and then . . . be able to put some phrases together.

So, their second language development focused on comprehension with basic oral production. Karen believed that having two primary language groups represented in her class precipitated a change in the structure of her language arts and ESL lessons. She now relied on a broader alternate day model for language of instruction as well as writer's workshop, content ELD, and teaming reading groups. As will become evident in the following sections, Karen's curriculum for language and literacy development reflects both her teaching philosophy and the influence of the broader school context.

Teaching Philosophy in Practice: Language Arts and ESL

During Year 1, Karen built the Spanish language arts curriculum around a particular theme, drawing upon thematic books and materials. During the lessons students participated in a variety of activities such as: interactive journals, student authored books, and student-initiated writing at a writing center, guided reading with Karen, and reading their own work. In addition, "more skills sort of lessons, phonics and stuff like that" supported students' efforts to explore the communicative purposes of reading and writing.

The following description of a language arts lesson documents the dominant role of native language literacy in the language arts curriculum:

> So that started with the whole group at the rug, and . . . trying to present the concept . . . that you can categorize food into different groups and that you need to eat from a variety of these groups. . . . And then going to their seats, and cutting out the food, is to reinforce that. . . . And then I also think it provides a natural way to write. Now they're going to write what they drew . . . and then, they can read it back to me. So they can focus on the reading too.

This description captures the elements of the language arts lessons which I observed. To open the lesson, Karen led an open-ended discussion with students about key concepts. Then she gave instructions for the following activity, while modeling the work they would accomplish. Then students worked individually, in small groups, or in pairs to accomplish a variety of literacy activities including interactive journals, guided reading with Karen, or a thematic follow-up activity. To close the lessons, Karen would bring the students together to share their work, which illustrated the communicative purposes of reading and writing and supported oral native language development. She also spoke explicitly about their progress in reading and writing:

> *You're going to second grade, and I want you to be ready for second grade. This means that I want you to read very well . . . and to do something well . . . you have to do it a lot. Practice. Practice. . . . So, everyday we have to practice reading, writing . . . everything.*

In contrast to the variety of activities which emphasized the social nature of reading and writing during language arts, ESL focused on oral language development through practice of vocabulary. In describing the actual lessons, Karen made several references to her role as instructor in teacher-centered activities as compared to the various student-centered activities for language arts. According to Karen, it was important to be "Doing things in such a way that they will be able to understand . . . (at the) level where they're going to be able to comprehend it, or just a little above, so that they can build on the skills they already have." She described how her lessons were "very visual, or hands on, doesn't require a lot of complicated language. It can be simple language." Karen added "I never ask them to write." The following "walk-through" of an ESL lesson illustrates a focus on vocabulary development:

> I would be presenting vocabulary within a concept, like within a . . . theme. And I would present the vocabulary to them. . . . I would try to use visuals, and have them repeat the words. And then I would have them try to use the words in sentences. And so then I would group them in certain ways, . . . It would be in pairs or walking around. . . . Then I also do a . . . whole group, like songs, and poetry, and TPR (total physical response). . . .

This description captures the focus on vocabulary that I observed during ESL. Karen would introduce vocabulary related to a broader concept, and would engage students in scripted practice of the words. Compared to the open-ended discussion during language arts, ESL focused on repeating vocabulary, using vocabulary in scripted role play, or complementing vocabulary with physical movement. Then, Karen provided instructions and modeling of the following activity, which never included writing. Students either worked with partners in a scripted role play or worked individually on art work related to the vocabulary. Karen's description of TPR included a group game played outside during physical education time, and songs or chants with corresponding physical movements. Overall, the constrained nature of Karen's ESL lessons contrasts with the language arts lessons which emphasize the social nature of reading and writing. While recognizing this contrast, it is important to situate Karen's philosophy and curriculum within the broader school context.

Broader School Context during Year One: Teaching ESL and Student Integration

Karen firmly believes that a different teacher for each language of instruction will enhance student language development. At two previous bilingual schools where Karen taught first grade, each teacher was responsible for her own students' Spanish language development, and the English language development of another class. According to Karen, having one teacher for English and one teacher for Spanish challenged students to use the language of instruction. As she explained, when she taught other students ESL they recognized her as an "English speaking person...only, (and) they would struggle to speak to me in English. Even though we could've communicated in Spanish better." Karen saw herself

as an English-speaking role model for those students, and as a strong Spanish-speaking role model for her own class. At the same time, Karen believes that integrating Spanish-speaking students with English-speaking students will enhance English language development. The English speaking students can serve as role models for the Spanish speaking students. So, Fairfield's structure for ESL instruction required that each teacher provide ESL instruction to his or her own students stood in direct conflict with Karen's philosophy about ESL. In fact, Karen's efforts to collaborate with an English speaking first grade teacher for ESL illustrated concerns about the larger cohesiveness of the bilingual program. These concerns focused on issues of teacher collaboration, student language goals, and student placement.

As described earlier, three times a week Karen's students were integrated with students from a monolingual English first grade class. Consequently, each group had both Spanish-speakers and English-speakers. During this time, Karen taught in Spanish, which served as a Spanish as a second language lesson (SSL) for the English speaking students. Andrea taught in English, which serves as an ESL lesson for the Spanish speaking students. Overall, Karen felt positive about the learning and student integration that had taken place: "The little bit that Andrea and I have collaborated for the mixing time has really made it better for the kids and for us." Still, the original goals of the integration and collaboration shifted during the year.

At first, Karen viewed this time as an opportunity to teach SSL to the English speakers and for Andrea to provide additional ESL to the Spanish speaking students. Unfortunately, Karen developed concerns that Andrea was not focusing on learning and developing the English language skills of her students. Karen noted that Andrea did not have a CLAD[12] credential, which might be better prepare her to teach ESL. Also, due to "behavior management problems," with the English speakers, Karen had started to use more English in

[12] CLAD certification is a California teaching credential which incorporates courses on how to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students. The official title is Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development.

her instruction. For Karen the primary goal of student integration shifted from language development to social integration: "Now I'm . . . emphasizing the importance of them integrating and the importance of them being exposed to the language, just having that exposure."

Weak Support Structures for Teacher Collaboration

Karen spoke about the lack of support for teacher collaboration at Fairfield Elementary. In general, first grade teachers did not collaborate to plan ESL curriculum because of the variety of ESL services, including both pull-out and in-class, and the loss of grade level planning time to additional staff meetings. In fact, Andrea and Karen were the only teachers collaborating, and "it was . . . this isolated thing, (and) it came to be really difficult." No other teachers collaborated to integrate students, and no planning time was set aside for Karen and Andrea to meet; they met during lunch or on their own time. Finally, no attempts were made to accommodate the collaboration schedule when planning for school wide enrichment classes. According to Karen, "more (collaboration) would be better . . . (and) having a set time built into the schedule for collaboration . . . would be really good." Karen also pointed to the lack of clarity for student goals and student placement as areas of concern.

Inconsistent Student Language Goals

Karen felt there was a "problem" because Fairfield Elementary had no clear articulation of goals for Spanish-speaking students when they finish the bilingual program. During her job interview at Fairfield, some people told her the bilingual program was transitional, while others told her that it was maintenance. Apparently, some of the staff at Fairfield believed that the bilingual program aimed to maintain students' primary language as they acquired English, while others believed the bilingual program aimed to transition students to English in the upper elementary grades. As Karen pointed out, "I think if you talked to each teacher, you'd get a different response. . . . I'm not sure if the goal is biliteracy, or just English." In turn, Karen

described how this resulted in varied academic experiences for individual students: "It depends on . . . what teacher a student ends up having, in the upper grades. So, they might go with a teacher who does a lot of Spanish or does very little. And for that one kid, it might end up being a maintenance program or transitional." Still, Karen was hopeful that the current review and revision of the bilingual program could result in a "program that is cohesive with continuity."

Lack of Strategic Student Placement

In Karen's previous teaching experiences, the schools had delineated whether a class would be "bilingual," all Spanish speakers or "modified bilingual," Spanish speakers and English speakers. At Fairfield, "we don't say we're going to do modified or bilingual classes, or we're going to have integration all day or integration part of the day. . . . We don't have that decided either. It just . . . varies from year to year." In fact, Karen described how some teachers have all Spanish-speakers with limited English proficiency, others have all Spanish-speakers and some of the students are competent bilinguals, and still others have both Spanish speakers and English speakers in the class. Karen described how during the 1996-1997 school year her class originally had several English speakers, and then because of class reduction and lack of parental support for SSL, the English speakers were moved to another class. According to Karen, not having a consistent student placement policy fails to consider the implications of different class configurations for instruction.

Even though Karen supported the separation of language instruction by teacher and teacher collaboration, her attempts to act on her beliefs were limited by the lack of a cohesive, school-wide model of teacher collaboration, delineated student language goals and instruction, and diverse class configurations. In the end, she changed her goals for the integration time, and relied on the self-contained ESL time, rather than on Andrea. Still, as the program moved

forward in restructuring the bilingual program, Karen tried to influence the future structure of ESL instruction and student integration.

Karen's Voice in the School Program

Karen believes that her previous experiences as a teacher can provide ideas and support the development of a cohesive bilingual program:

> I can come and say . . . this is what we did and it worked really well . . . if you have one of the members of the staff who has done it . . . . I think that helps, because they'll have a little more confidence in it.

During a staff meeting which I observed, Karen voiced her concerns about various issues including teacher collaboration, teacher responsibilities for ESL instruction, and student integration. The purpose of the meeting, as stated by the principal, was to discuss in grade level teams the possibility of teaming to integrate students from bilingual and non-bilingual classrooms. The kindergarten and first grade teachers discussed these issues together. Karen suggested a structure where students would receive primary language instruction in the morning and integrated English instruction in the afternoon. She also suggested that the focus of integration be English language development, with the possibility of Spanish language development for the following year. Finally, Karen voiced her support for teaching none of her own students ESL when students were integrated.

At one point in the meeting, the Title VII coordinator approached the first grade group and suggests a scenario where no bilingual teacher teaches her own students ESL. As the Title VII coordinator spoke, Karen sketched out a model for how the classes could be integrated to make this possible. She shared the model with the group as she talked about her current frustrations:

> During English time, my students don't want to speak English to me. I have to constantly say 'Now say it in English' because they see me as Spanish speaking because I speak Spanish to them all day and only a little bit each day in English. . . . And so if . . . they got all their English from another teacher there wouldn't be that problem.

The Title VII coordinator suggested that if a student did not know a teacher speaks Spanish, he would be "challenged more to utilize. . . English." Karen closed the conversation with an animated description of a Latina teacher who never taught her own students ESL:

> She spoke Spanish excellently, but these kids came to her for English. And the little boy was trying to . . . say blanket. But, he couldn't think of the word, he's like 'you know, at night, you go, you like down' and he's saying this all in English. Oh, blanket! But, he had to use so much language instead of just saying *blanket*. He . . . never resorted to saying the word in Spanish.

This statement highlights Karen's beliefs about how to best support students' language development, and her efforts to shape the school's structure for ESL and student integration. At the time of this meeting, Karen's suggestion was viewed as a viable possibility by the rest of her grade level team, but some of the teachers were not concerned about teaching ESL to their own students. In addition, while the teachers decided to focus on English language development, they decided to focus on "non threatening" content areas such as art, music, and physical education to enhance social development, as described by the Title VII coordinator. The discussion around teacher role, goals, and content for integration is indicative of how different teaching philosophies are manifest in curriculum and instruction. Still, teachers were not given the opportunity to openly discuss their teaching philosophies regarding language development and appropriate instructional support. In fact, these concerns arose once again in Year 2.

Broader School Context: Teacher Collaboration and Student Placement One Year Later

According to Karen, "Last year there really wasn't much of a program, that I could see. There was not much articulation. It really seemed like each teacher had their own philosophy." For Year 2, Karen described how the bilingual program had been clearly articulated for the one immersion class at kindergarten but had not been clearly articulated for the remaining bilingual classrooms:

> We had the immersion program, but that was only at kindergarten, . . . and a lot of articulation . . . there's a model there and we're trying to follow the model as closely as possible. . . . But that was only kindergarten, and once again at all the other grades, everybody is just trying to find a way to make this work.

So, while the kindergarten immersion classroom had a clearly articulated program, the remaining bilingual classrooms were left to "find a way to make this work."

Integrated Student Placement

At the same time, integration of Spanish and English speaking students articulated by the Title VII grant for the kindergarten classroom was implemented in the regular bilingual classrooms as well. At the beginning of the school year the school was going to attempt a structure similar to what Karen and Andrea had developed the previous year. Spanish speaking students would be in a bilingual class, and English speaking students would be in another class. Then, the respective teachers would meet to collaborate and integrate the students. However, sheer student numbers resulted in integrated classes at each grade level, which highlights Karen's concern about student placement. When Karen approached the Title VII coordinator, "Alisa was like, no, you can't because the grant says they had to be integrated. But, I thought, OK that's good when you're doing the immersion program but maybe we should be able to have other options till it gets to our grade level. But she insisted we had to follow that."

Inconsistent Student Language Goals and Structural Support for Teacher Collaboration

Still, while non-immersion bilingual classes were integrated, even the end of the year Title VII report does not specify the language of instruction for literacy and academic instruction for these classes, "Students in Spanish bilingual classrooms receive English language development instruction and both literacy instruction and academic instruction in either Spanish or English." So, as Karen describes, "You're supposed to follow the rules in the immersion classrooms, and then the other classrooms do what makes the most sense in the

situation. . . . I don't think there was enough discussion. How are we going to deal with this? . . . It was just left up to me to decide, what am I going to do?"

Fortunately, as compared to the previous year when teacher collaboration at each grade level was not common, the Title VII coordinator and the principal encouraged bilingual teachers at each grade level to collaborate on goals and instruction. Karen described how she and the other second grade teachers:

> really worked a lot as a team. And so our goals were the same. . . . That was the one good thing about the grant, is that we . . . we got substitutes . . . for half a day, once a month, so that we could articulate our goals and plan units together. And that made a really cohesive second grade, a lot of the same things going on in the classrooms.

In fact, she described how in light of the integrated classes, she and "the other bilingual second grade teacher . . . decided to do alternate day method."

While Karen believed in the alternate day method, she felt as though the school program did not fully support her efforts. Karen discussed how the integration of English only students with little Spanish proficiency proved challenging at second grade. In fact, many of the students and parents of English only students had not enrolled in her classroom by request: "they really didn't enroll in this you know, (laughs a little) 'Oh, I want my kid to be in a bilingual program.' . . . The parents hadn't really bought into it." Karen even makes a comparison between English speaking students assigned to the immersion class and her class:

> I had . . . students in my class who . . . didn't know it was a bilingual class, but they (were) told when they (were) in the office, but they didn't even know what that meant. And here I am doing Spanish every other day? (frustrated). . . Whereas the immersion program, the parents go scope out the classroom, especially the English speaking parents, they visit the class, and they really are informed.

In addition, Karen was concerned that her efforts to provide both Spanish and English instruction to all students at second grade would not be drawn upon by the following grade levels. She spoke of how much effort the alternate day method required, and wondered

whether her efforts were in vain: "And it's so much effort to then say next year, what are they doing? . . . The impression I got at third grade was like they used Spanish only when necessary." Karen felt that the alternate day method could be successful, but only if the whole school was committed, like a nearby school district:

> I got that strategy from the San Rodrigo School District. They have a bilingual school and the whole school does it (alternate days). It makes sense, if the whole school is doing it. But if you're just doing it on your own (pauses) . . . but, I didn't know what the alternative was.

So, while Karen felt frustrated in her efforts to implement an alternate day method in her bilingual classroom, she also stood fast to her commitment to provide native language instruction to Spanish speaking students. Still, she felt that perhaps a whole school effort could have decided on a better alternative: "But, maybe things would be done differently if we'd looked at the whole picture instead of looking right at my grade."

Karen believes it is critical for teachers across grades to discuss the bilingual program, its goals and instruction. Since the immersion program will be moving up through the grades, it is important for teachers to discuss how to best meet the needs of the students:

> We have integrated classrooms and how can we best meet these kids' needs? Discuss it, and make a plan, and continue on a regular basis, talking. Because what Alisa kept saying, 'Well, at each grade level you make your decision, because each grade level has a different situation.' But I think we need for there to be a talk at all the grade levels, getting together and talking about it.

Lack of Program Articulation in Title VII Meetings

Unfortunately, this need was not met effectively during Year 2. While the Title VII planning meetings might have provided an arena for such a discussion, they focused on budget issues and reports on conferences:

> There wasn't a lot. . . . We took a while deciding on how we would vote on things. . . . There wasn't really any big things except for at the end of the year . . . around the budget and aides. . . . We'd spend time talking about what happened at CABE[13], so we would report. Or, Tim, (the external evaluator) . . . would come and speak to us, how he's assessing the program. So, it wasn't like decisions being made.

[13] She is referring to the annual conference of the California Association for Bilingual Education.

The Title VII meeting that I observed fit Karen's description. Eight different issues were discussed during the meeting: voting, dissemination of information to parents, goals beyond language, quantitative report, itemized budget for 1997-1998, itemized budget for 1998-1999, funding for instructional assistants, and before and after school programs. Of these eight issues, only two dealt specifically with articulation of the goals and instruction for the bilingual program. When incorporating goals beyond language was mentioned by one teacher, it did not lead to a larger discussion of goals. The discussion of dissemination of information to parents focused on how to better inform parents of the bilingual program. As Karen proposed:

> *It's possible to have a prerequisite for parents who have children in the bilingual program that they attend a presentation on the bilingual program, not only the immersion program, not only an explanation but a presentation. And we could have three presentations to ensure that everyone is able to attend.*

So, while this might help inform parents of the bilingual program, and could alleviate some of the frustration Karen expressed regarding English only students who did not choose to be in the bilingual program, it did not address the issue of articulating the bilingual program across the grades. In addition, it did not resolve the issue of integration, whether non-immersion bilingual classes should consist of both Spanish speaking students and English speaking students. These were issues left unresolved, and still, the influence of the broader school context and Karen's teaching philosophy are evident in her language and literacy curriculum.

Teaching Philosophy in Practice One Year Later: Writer's Workshop and Content ELD

As discussed above, the overarching structure for instruction incorporated an alternate day plan for the general language of instruction: "This year I used the language of the day for just general instruction. . . . If I was giving them direct lesson, I would use the language of the day. I would use (it) for the other lessons like math, science, p.e." Within this larger structure, Karen described her language and literacy instruction as happening primarily in three types of lessons: writer's workshop, reading instruction, and English language development (ELD).

Writer's workshop and reading instruction happened primarily in the student's native language. English language development, aimed at Spanish speakers, happened during other content lessons when English was the language of the day.

For reading, students received primary language instruction: "Everyday the students would receive primary language instruction in literacy, . . . so they'd get all their instruction in their primary language for reading. . . . We grouped . . . the kids for reading, by language and if they were a higher or lower reader." In comparison, the previous year "for language arts I used to do centers. So, I could get a small group for reading, to do like guided reading . . . I really integrated. This is the thing I like better about last year, I was able to integrate reading and writing and the stories were read with our other (content areas), our social studies or our science unit at the time." So, Karen feels as though reading instruction which integrates students across classrooms does not lend itself to the integration of other content areas. Still, the reading groups focused on building students' native language fluency: "I just had to be reading, because I wanted them to read forty minutes a day, I wanted them to be reading."

For writer's workshop students also received native language instruction: "And then, writer's workshop, when I worked one on one with them I would use their primary language." As compared to the previous year, where Karen was "really emphasizing journals a lot in first grade," she shifted to writer's workshop because it:

> works better at second grade than it ever could have at first grade. . . . I liked the process of it, the student choice, I liked that it allowed you to do a lot of one on one. I liked that it allowed . . . students to work together, a lot of . . . student empowerment.

In addition, the structure of writer's workshop encouraged students to engage in a diversity of writing: "We did letters, poetry, stories, journals."[14]

---

[14] The follow-up study included observations of writer's workshop and not reading instruction, therefore only writer's workshop will be discussed in greater detail.

The following description of a typical writer's workshop lesson documents the focus on various steps of the writing process:

> The kids come in and . . . as soon as they get their things put away, they're supposed to pull out their writer's workshop folder. And then at the beginning I had them list topics that they could write about. And so, they would look at one of these topics and they would just start writing on it. And . . . they had a choice of different types of writing they could do. . . . They could write a letter or . . . a story. And then after they had three pieces, rough drafts. They'd pick their favorite one and they'd pick a partner and they'd edit together. . . . And then they were supposed to put it in my tray. And then go back and sit down . . . and start a new piece of writing. And then . . . I would call the student. . . . Sometimes I wouldn't feel like I had the time to draw out the . . . editing from them. . . . And so, they would go back, and they would copy it over, and they would make a title page, and we would call that publishing it, and then they would get to share what they published with the class. . . . They really like publishing it. . . . That really made them feel good.

Both writer's workshop lessons that I observed, followed the basic procedure described above. Students worked individually on creating a first draft or rewriting a revised draft; students worked in pairs for editing their work, and Karen spent most of her time conferencing with individual students, editing their drafts for "publication." To close the writer's workshop lesson, once Karen gathered the students together on the rug to listen to a student share his published work and the other time she gave students feedback on their overall progress: "You guys did such a good job again. You're becoming such good writers. Such good authors. I am very proud of you."

In contrast to the constrained nature of ESL during the previous school year, English language development was now: "integrated into the day. . . . They're learning it through content instruction. And I think that's a good way . . . to learn it. They learned a lot of English this year." This focus on content when English was the language of the day translated to lessons which moved beyond practicing vocabulary. During the whole group discussion, Karen led an open-ended discussion about a particular concept, geologists. Then, she described and modeled the activity that students would do in pairs: sifting different size rocks, putting them in order from smallest to largest, labeling the different size rocks. As Karen

described, even though the focus was on learning English through content, she still used some of her former teaching strategies:

> I still . . . like visuals a lot. Demonstration is very important during a science lesson. I actually sifted the rocks for them first and talked. . . . So I sat and did it, right? So, the fact that I was talking and actually doing it at the same time really helps students who don't have a high level of English. But the great thing about those methodologies is that it helps the English speakers too. And . . . it's just a good way to teach.

As students worked on the activity in pairs, Karen walked around the room and asked most students to name the rock types in the appropriate order in English. Still, students were encouraged to complete the follow-up worksheet in their native language. To close the lesson, Karen gathered the students on the rug and lead an open-ended discussion about what they knew about geologists. She recorded the discussion on a large piece of chart paper, and the students read the statement aloud in unison. Overall, Karen's English instruction shifted away from ESL instruction which emphasized vocabulary to teaching English through content. The lesson I observed taught English through science and encouraged students to produce oral language beyond the repetition of vocabulary.

Summary and Discussion

Since bilingual education research focuses on program evaluation and program implementation, it tends to overlook the critical role teachers play in the actual implementation of policies. Teachers make decisions about student language goals and instruction which shape the actual academic experiences of their students. Therefore, to better address the needs of language minority students, research in bilingual education should attend to the role of the teacher in learning and instruction (Guthrie, 1992; Pease-Alvarez & Hakuta, 1992). The purpose of this study was to investigate how a teacher makes decisions about student language goals and instruction, what influences these decisions, and how these individual decisions are linked to and constructed by the school's bilingual program.

Teacher Reflection on Philosophy and Practice

As collaborative relationships develop between federal, state, and local education agencies, special attention should focus on the role of teachers in reconstructing the goals of program policies (Darling-Hammond, 1990). Policy is not merely implemented, rather it is enacted through daily interactions among teachers, students and the larger school community. While Title VII has provided funds for personnel training, the nature of training must move beyond the learning of effective teaching strategies. As policy is enacted in local school communities, beliefs, knowledge, and the social context of the school will shape the daily reality of the educational program for language minority students.

Karen's Teaching Philosophy in Practice

Through an interpretive frame I investigated Karen's student language goals and how they were enacted in her instruction. Over a two year period, I found that her teaching philosophy shapes the language goals for students. Karen believes that students should develop strong native language literacy and oral skills, while expanding oral English proficiency. During Year 1, this philosophy was reflected in her goals regarding Spanish and English, as well as her instruction.

Over a period of two years, literacy in the native language was a first priority for all Spanish speaking students. During Year 1, this aim was met through the language arts lessons, during Year 2 it was met through writer's workshop and reading groups. During Year 1, there was a clear contrast between the open nature of language production during language arts and the constrained and scripted nature of language production during ESL. This contrast between language arts and ESL instruction did in fact encourage Karen to reflect upon and analyze her beliefs about language development and instruction. In turn, her instruction during Year 2 for English language development changed.

Karen's philosophy supported native language instruction, development, and literacy. During Year 1, it also discouraged the introduction of English literacy at first grade, and instead focused on English oral language production. This focus on language production played out in a constrained manner during ESL. Karen referred to Krashen and Cummins when describing her philosophy about language development. According to Krashen (in Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991), language learning occurs without explicit instruction. Teachers only need to provide comprehensible input, language at a level just above what the student can understand. Unfortunately, "literal and uncritical application of theory is certain to misrepresent the theory and fail as a pedagogical practice" (Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994, p. 218). In other words, only focusing on language production and comprehensible input will not further English language development.

In order for language minority students to succeed in English academics, they must shift from a social level of language to an academic level (Cummins, 1981; Fillmore, 1992). To aid this shift, Cummins (1994) supports native language instruction and native language literacy skills before turning to second language literacy skills. Karen has consciously incorporated these ideas into her philosophy and the Spanish language arts curriculum. In Year 2 she strove to create a genuine, language-rich environment during the ESL component of the day to further English language development.

> It seems what teachers have to do is provide students with a rich and varied exposure to the language. . . . What turns this kind of language environment into one that "teaches language" is for language . . . to be used in genuine communication. (Fillmore, 1989, 330)

She encouraged students to produce language in open and communicative manners, not in a constrained, scripted manner. The language-rich environment for English language development included teaching English through specific content (Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). The lesson I observed used science content as the vehicle for learning language. The language-rich environment could have also included teaching English through a thematic unit

used for the rest of the curriculum (Miramontes, Nadeau, & Commins, 1997a) or teaching English through genuine communication about a topic of personal interest (Fillmore, 1989). Karen expanded on how to use content areas to teach English in a less constrained manner. Still unexplained is why she allowed students incorporate native language into the English language development lesson I observed.

Students can also be introduced to second language literacy before they have mastered the language. Provided that they can deal with English at a receptive level, students can benefit from second language reading instruction. Full productive control of the second language is not necessary. English reading can 'expose LEP students to useful data about the new language which they would otherwise not encounter' (Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). Still, English literacy instruction should proceed native language literacy to be most successful. Consequently, Karen could still introduce English literacy activities to parallel Spanish literacy activities with students already literate in Spanish. One specific pedagogical practice would be to introduce English interactive journals (Hudelson, 1987; Hudelson & Serna, 1994). This would engage students in genuine communication about topics of personal interest in English, in a written format. She could also incorporate children's literature relevant to the theme. This could add to the richness of the language environment (Fillmore, 1995). Finally, she could incorporate writing in the second language as part of writer's workshop.

Karen's past experiences and beliefs regarding separation of language instruction clearly affected her ESL instruction and guided her attempts at teacher collaboration during Year 1. Karen believes that ESL instruction is best provided by a different, equally qualified teacher, than the one who provides Spanish instruction. Karen felt isolated in her attempts to structure language instruction, and consequently, attempted to build a collaborative relationship with an English speaking teacher.

In fact, it is possible to encourage the exclusive use of English by supporting and modeling the use of English, and rewarding students for using English to communicate. Over time, students will respond to a consistent use of English as the language of instruction with increased participation in the target language (Miramontes et al., 1997a). Still, while LEP students can in fact benefit from separate ESL instruction, they will also benefit from integrated English instruction. They need time to fully participate at their own level of proficiency, and they also need time to interact with native speakers of English to access quality models of English language proficiency (Fillmore & Valadez, 1986; Miramontes et al., 1997a). Certainly this reason alone should encourage teachers like Karen to seek out integration of their LEP students with native English speakers on a regular basis, and this integration could lead to teacher collaboration. During Year 2, Karen's integrated class lent itself to both of the situations described above. Throughout the follow-up study, Karen did not mention frustration with Spanish speaking students speaking Spanish during ELD, and although she did not specify why, she did value the alternate day method with an integrated class of students. As schools recognize that a teacher's philosophy affects the decisions she makes about goals and instruction, they should establish structures for teachers to continually reflect and critically analyze their instruction and philosophies.

School-wide Reflection and Discussion

During Year 1, Karen's efforts to improve ESL for her students materialized in her attempts to influence school wide programmatic possibilities during the staff meeting and discussion with colleagues. As Karen played an active role during the staff planning meeting, differences of opinion among teachers were not discussed at the level of philosophy, to build a common vision of language development and the required, appropriate instruction. In fact, schools often try to create a vision without "addressing the assumptions or belief systems held by staff members, or failing to fully consider the implications of stated beliefs" (Miramontes et

al., 1997: 82). While the teachers decided to focus on English language development, they decided to focus on "non threatening" content areas such as art, music, and physical education to emphasize social development, as described by the Title VII coordinator. The discussion around teacher role, goals, and content for integration is indicative of how different teaching philosophies are manifest in curriculum and instruction. The narrowing of goals and content areas poses a concern. As Cummins (1994) and Fillmore (1992) explain, it is important for students to develop academic language as well as basic communication skills in the second language. Unfortunately, social integration as the only goal of integration and "non threatening" content areas will not enhance academic language.

During Year 3, Karen recognized progress in building a common vision at the individual grade levels. She appreciated the opportunity she had to meet with the other second grade teachers, to articulate goals and instruction for students. Still, she spoke of the lack of articulation across grade levels. While this lack of articulation did not deter her efforts to provide native language instruction to Spanish speaking students, it did cause her to question the value of the alternate day program for English speaking students. She wondered whether her efforts were in vain. In addition the lack of articulation also contributed to a lack of support from parents who had not voluntarily placed their English speaking students in bilingual classrooms. This lack of support further undermined Karen's commitment to the alternate day method.

Furthermore, Karen expressed concerns about the mandatory integration of all classes. Overall, Karen believed that the need of Spanish speaking students for native language instruction was more important than mandatory integration in the non-immersion bilingual classes. The school needed to look at the "whole picture," beyond each grade level, and decide on better alternatives.

As schools develop a bilingual program, teachers, staff, administrators, and parents should all take part in conversations which focus on student goals and not just procedural issues (Miramontes, Nadeau, & Commins, 1997b; Taylor & Bogotch, 1994). Schools must also create support structures for teachers to share their philosophies with one another and to work together to build a common vision for the school.

Therefore, as schools encourage teachers to be reflective practitioners and to share their philosophies with one another and focus on student goals, collaborative relationships can be built. In turn, this collaboration can avoid the division and resentment that so often arises between bilingual and general education staff.

A cohesive bilingual program, built upon shared teacher contributions and philosophies, can result in a cohesive academic experience for language minority students. As teachers communicate about philosophies to build a common vision, they should also discuss curriculum and content development because:

> *The issue of what to teach and how to teach it extends beyond a single teacher or grade level. It involves how the curriculum will be articulated across grade levels within a program. . . . The goal of the decision-making is to create a rigorous curriculum that prepares students to be academically successful.* (Miramontes et al., 1997a, 148-149)

Karen sees her teaching philosophy as complementary to the Title VII goals of high academic achievement for limited English proficient students and developing bilingual skills and multicultural awareness for all students. Therefore, Karen has faith that the current restructuring of the bilingual program will result in a program that better fits her teaching philosophy. She recognizes that to build a cohesive program requires both time and effort, and Karen believes that Fairfield Elementary has begun this process. As she stated at the end of Year 1: "I think what I see happening is that it's going to be slow. But if everybody keeps wanting it to become cohesive, and keeps working at it, keeps working at it, we'll get there.

more and more . . . next year it'll be a little more cohesive, and the next hopefully more and more, . . . as time goes on."

References

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Bialystok, E., & Hakuta, K. (1994). *In other words: The science and psychology of second-language acquisition*. New York: Harper Collins.

Bilingual Education Act, Pub. L. No. (90-247), 81 Stat. 816 (1968).

Bilingual Education Act, Pub. L. No. (93-380), 88 Stat. 503 (1974).

Bilingual Education Act, Pub. L. No. (95-561), 92 Stat. 2268 (1978).

Bilingual Education Act, Pub. L. No. (98-511), 98 Stat. 2370 (1984).

Bilingual Education Act, Pub. L. No. (100-297), 102 Stat. 279 (1988).

Bilingual Education Act, Pub L. No. (103-382), (1994).

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (pp. 709-725). New York: Macmillan.

Clandinin, D. J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge: A study of teachers' classroom images. *Curriculum Inquiry, 15*(4), 361-385.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language developments in promoting educational success for language minority students, *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-50). Los Angeles: evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Instructional policy into practice: "The power of the bottom over the top". *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12*(3), 339-347.

Elbaz, F. (1981). The teacher's 'practical knowledge': Report of a case study. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*(1), 43-71.

Fillmore, L. W. (1989). Teachability and second language acquisition. In R. S. Busch & M. Rice (Eds.), *The teachability of language* (pp. 311-332). Baltimore: Paul Brookes.

Fillmore, L. W. (1992). Language minority students and school participation: What kind of English is needed? *Journal of Education, 164*(2), 143-157.

Fillmore, L. W. (1995). Written texts as inputs in second language learning. , 1-19.

Fillmore, L. W., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 648-685). New York: Macmillan.

Genishi, C., Dubetz, N., & Focarino, C. (1995). Reconceptualizing theory through practice: Insights from a first-grade teacher and second language theorists. *Advances in Early Education and Day Care, 7*, 123-152.

Grossman, P. L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Guthrie, G. P. (1992). Bilingual education in a Chinese community: An ethnography in progress. In M. Saravia-Shore & S. F. Arvizu (Eds.), *Cross cultural literacy: Ethnographies of communication in multiethnic classrooms* (pp. 173-210). New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Hudelson, S. (1987). The role of native language literacy in the rducation of language minority children. *Language Arts, 64*(8), 827-841.

Hudelson, S., & Serna, I. A. (1994). Beginning literacy in English in whole language bilingual program. In A. D. Flurkey & R. J. Meyer (Eds.), *Under the whole language umbrella: Many voices, many cultures* . Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Jimenez, R. T., & Gersten, R. (1999). Lessons and dilemmas derived from the literacy instruction of two Latina/o teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 36*(2), 265-302.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. New York: Longman Inc.

Miramontes, O. B., Nadeau, A., & Commins, N. L. (1997a). *Restructuring schools for linguistic diversity: Linking decision-making to effective programs.* New York: Teacher's College Press, Columbia University.

Miramontes, O. B., Nadeau, A., & Commins, N. L. (1997b). *Restructuring schools for linguistic diversity: Linking decision making to effective programs.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Pease-Alvarez, L., & Hakuta, K. (1992). Enriching our views of bilingualism and bilingual education. *Educational Researcher, 21*(2), 4-6.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 313-333.

Taylor, D. L., & Bogotch, I. E. (1994). School-level effects of teachers' participation in decision making. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16*(3), 302-319.